

## REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated May 12, 2004, and have made amendments to the claims. Claims 5-10 and 14-27 are pending. Claims 5, 8, 16, 20 and 25 are independent claims. Claims 5, 8, 14-16, 20 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been entered. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

### Amendments to Drawings

In the Office action, the Examiner indicated that the drawings submitted with the prior response to Office action on February 9, 2004 were acceptable.

### Claim for Foreign Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

In the Office action, the Examiner acknowledged the Applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

### Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 14 and 15 due to an informality. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the definition of the term "a HDD module" was not defined.

It is respectfully noted that the specification as originally filed, at paragraph 47, defines "HDD" as "hard disk drive." With this paper, claims 14 and 15 have been amended to recite "a hard disk drive (HDD) module" in order to provide further definition for the term "a HDD." It is respectfully submitted that the grounds for objection have been overcome and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

### § 102 Rejections

Claims 5-10 and 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being anticipated by Kalmanek, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,335). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With this paper, independent claims 5 and 8 have been amended to recite "wherein generating the alarm comprises converting alarm data of a hard disk drive (HDD) module to first serial data, converting parallel input state data of a fan and cables to second serial data, converting the first and second serial data to parallel data, and adding the parallel data to state data of ejection, injection, and operation of boards, input in parallel from a printed board assembly (PBA)."

With this paper, independent claims 16 and 20 have been amended to recite “wherein reporting the call signal channel failures comprises converting alarm data of a hard disk drive (HDD) module to first serial data, converting parallel input state data of a fan and cables to second serial data, converting the first and second serial data to parallel data, and adding the parallel data to state data of ejection, injection, and operation of boards, input in parallel from a printed board assembly (PBA).”

With this paper, independent claim 25 has been amended to recite “wherein the at least one PSTN interface and the at least one IPN interface comprise a printed board assembly (PBA) providing alarm data of the at least one PSTN and the at least one IPN, a first parallel-to-serial converter converting alarm data of a hard disk drive (HDD) module to serial data, a second parallel-to-serial converter converting parallel input state data of a fan and cables to serial data, and a serial-to-parallel converter converting the data from the first and second parallel-to-serial converters to parallel data, and adding the parallel data to state data of ejection, injection, and operation of boards, input in parallel from the PBA.”

It is respectfully noted that the Examiner indicated, in paragraph 7 of the Office action, that “Kalmanek et al. fails to disclose the structure of the device as claimed in the underlined section [of claims 14 and 15] above.” It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 5, 8, 16, 20 and 25 have been amended to recite the allowable subject matter of independent claims 14 and 15, as indicated by the Examiner in paragraph 7 of the Office action.

It is respectfully asserted that independent claims 5, 8, 16, 20 and 25 are allowable over the cited reference. It is further respectfully asserted that claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 17-19, 21-24, 26 and 27, which depend from independent claims 5, 8, 16, 20 and 25, respectively, also are allowable over the cited reference.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that claims 14 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the objections indicated in the Office action. As noted previously, claims 14 and 15 have been amended to overcome the objections. It is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that claims 5-10 and 16-27 of the present application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the Office action, the Examiner did not acknowledge the amendment to the title made with the prior response sent on February 9, 2004. Please note the new title of the application is NETWORK-BASED TELEPHONY GATEWAY AND NETWORK-BASED TELEPHONY METHOD.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & SCHMADEKA

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder  
Registration No. 51,127  
Attorney for Applicant

Date: August 2, 2004

Customer No. 035884

801 S. Figueroa Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: 213-623-2221  
Facsimile: 213-623-2211